

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,913	MAEDA, MITSURU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew Heneghan	2134	

All Participants:

Status of Application: 12 April 2007

(1) Matthew Heneghan.

(3) _____

(2) Brian Klock.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 April 2007

Time: 9:00 AM EDT

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

32

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner proposed an Examiner's amendment cancelling claim 32 because it would have introduced new matter, which would bring the application into allowability. Attorney Klock agreed to the amendment.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

KAMBIZ ZAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

M. H. Heneghan
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)